REMARKS

Claims 63-68, 75-77, 79-81, 83, 86-90, 92 and 120 are currently pending, of which claims 63 and 120 are in independent form.

By way of this response, claims 63 and 120 have been amended.

Claims 91 and 121 have been cancelled without prejudice, limitation, waiver or estoppel.

Favorable reconsideration of the present application as currently constituted is respectfully requested.

Regarding the Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103

Part A

Claims 63-68, 76-81, 86, 89-91, 120 and 121 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Motorola AirMobile Wireless Software for Lotus cc:Mail, Version 1.1 (hereinafter *AirMobile*), in view of U.S. Patent 6,636,965 to Beyda et al. (hereinafter the *Beyda* reference), further in view of WyndMail (WyndMail for Windows CE, 1997; hereinafter the *WyndMail* reference) and comp.mail.sendmail ("Need to rewrite From Field on outgoing mail, May 23, 1996; hereinafter the *Sendmail* reference).

The Examiner has commented as follows in respect of the foregoing rejections:

Regarding claim 63, AirMobile shows a method of redirecting data messages between a messaging host system (Fig. 1; cc:Mail Post Office Server) and a wireless mobile communication device (Fig. 1, wireless cc:Mail Mobile user), comprising

receiving a data message at the messaging host system for a user, wherein the data message is received from a sender (Fig. 1, Post Office Server receiving data message and storing it in the user's cc:Mail mailbox at The Post-Office server, pages 10-11)

detecting the data message at the messaging host system (Fig. 1, Post-Office Server recognizes the incoming data message from the user once the. user has registered with his mailbox with the cc:Mail Post Office Server, pages 10-11);

forwarding a copy of the data message (AirMobile, transferring emails or cc:mails) from the messaging host system (Fig. 1, Post- Office Server) to a wireless redirector host system (Fig. 1, AirMobile Wireless for cc:Mail Server)

determining whether the copy of the data message should be redirected from the wireless redirector host system to the wireless mobile communication device (Fig. 1, pages 10-11,25-27, 35, determining the routing or downloading or transferring of messages to mobile user from the AirMobile Wireless for cc:Mail Server); and

if the data message should be redirected, then transmitting the copy of the data message from the wireless redirector host system to the user's wireless mobile communication device (Fig. 1, pages 10-11,25-27,35).

AirMobile further shows downloading messages from and uploading messages to the users inbox, but AirMobile does not explicitly show a 1 st and a 2nd address. AirMobile additionally shows where the forwarding to the wireless director is via a local area network connection

between the messaging host system and the wireless redirector host system, but does not show where said local area network connection is instead a wide area network connection.

Beyda shows where email servers can be accessed over local area network connections or wide area network connections, include where said email servers are involved in forwarding messages (col. 2 lines 38-63), thus disclosing where the forwarding to the wireless director is Via a wide area network connection between the messaging host system and the wireless redirector host system.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the disclosure of AirMobile with that of Beyda in order to encompass a wider variety of messages processing system configurations, thus providing for additional flexibility in implementing the disclosed method/system.

AirMobile in view of Beyda do not show all of where the data message received at the messaging host system is addressed to a first address of the user associated with the messaging host system and processing the copy of the data message to add a second address that is associated with the user's wireless mobile communication device; receiving a reply message from the wireless mobile communication device responsive to the data message; and causing the reply message to be transmitted to the sender of the data message wherein the user's first address is configured as the reply message's originating address.

WyndMail shows where the data message received at the messaging host system is addressed to a first address of the user associated with the messaging host system (pgs. 1 and 4) and
processing the copy of the data message to add a second address that is associated with the user's wireless mobile communication device (pgs. 1,3,4);
using the second address associated with the wireless mobile communication device via wireless transmission network (pgs. 1,4);

receiving a reply message from the wireless mobile communication device responsive to the data message (pg. 4); and

causing the reply message to be transmitted to the sender of the data message wherein the user's first address is configured as the reply message's reply-to address (pg. 4).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the disclosure of AirMobile in view of Beyda with that of Wynd Mail in order to support additional methods of communication (WyndMail, pg. 1) as well as to better manage how reply messages are handled (WyndMail, pg. 4).

AirMobile in view of Beyda and WyndMail show ensuring the desired reply-to address is used, but do not explicitly show where the originating address is also updated.

comp.mail.sendmail shows updating both the reply-to address and the originating address (that is, the 'from' address – pg. 1 and 2)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the disclosure of AirMobile in view of Beyda and WyndMail with that of comp.mail.sendmail in order to ensure that the user's outgoing reply messages are fully modified to appear to have come from the address the user desires, thus better ensuring the transparent use of multiple email addresses.

. . .

Additionally, base claims 120 and 121 appear to be rejected based on the same reasoning.

Without acquiescing in the characterization provided in the pending Office Action with respect to Applicant's prior

PATENT APPLICATION
Attorney Docket No.: 1400-1072PC1
Client No.: 10072-US-PCT1

response(s), the applied references, pending claims, or both, Applicant respectfully submits that the above §103(a) rejections have been overcome or otherwise rendered moot by way of the present response. Base claim 63 is directed to an embodiment of a method of redirecting data messages between a messaging host system and a wireless mobile communication device. As currently constituted, the claimed embodiment includes, *inter alia*, processing a copy of a data message at a wireless redirector system to repackage it with an outer envelope having a second address that is associated with a user's wireless mobile communication device. Additionally, the claimed embodiment further includes, *inter alia*, receiving a reply message that is repackaged in an outer envelope at the wireless mobile communication device, wherein the outer envelope has an address associated with the wireless redirector system, and removing the outer envelope of the repackaged reply message and causing it to be transmitted to a sender wherein the user's first address is configured as the reply message's originating address.

Substantially similar features are also added in the pending base claim 120 that is directed to an embodiment of a wireless redirector host system.

At the outset, it should be recognized that the primary reference, i.e., *AirMobile*, fails to provide any disclosure with

-17-

respect to packaging data messages in an outer envelope, either in the direction towards the wireless mobile communication device from a server entity or in the direction towards the server entity from the wireless mobile communication device. Nor is there any disclosure or suggestion in *AirMobile* regarding removing an outer envelope of a repackaged reply message received from the wireless mobile communication device in order for causing the reply message to be redirected to a sender.

Applicant respectfully submits that the various secondary references are of no avail in curing the foregoing deficiencies of the *AirMobile* reference. The *Beyda* reference appears directed to a message processing system that allows a user to create message for delivery to a number of recipients over local area network or wide area network connections. Further, neither the *WyndMail* nor the *Sendmail* references appear even remotely concerned with the claimed features relating to packaging data messages in an outer envelope, either in the direction towards the wireless mobile communication device from a server entity or in the direction towards the server entity from the wireless mobile communication device. Additionally, none of the secondary references, either alone or in any reasonable combination, teach or suggest the features relating to removing an outer envelope of a repackaged

reply message received from the wireless mobile communication device in order for causing the reply message to be redirected to a sender.

At least for the foregoing reasons, Applicant takes the position that the applied references, either alone or in any combination, do not teach or suggest all the limitations of the pending base claims 63 and 120 as currently constituted. It is therefore believed that base claims 63 and 120 are in condition for allowance. Dependent claims 64-68, 76-81 and 89-90 depending from base claim 63 are also allowable over the applied art of record at least for the same reasons.

Part B

Additional dependent claims stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over a number of combinations: (i) claim 75 over the *AirMobile*, *Beyda*, *WyndMail* and *Sendmail* references and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,138,146 to Moon et al. (hereinafter the *Moon* reference); (ii) claims 83, 84, 87 and 88 over the *AirMobile*, *Beyda*, *WyndMail* and *Sendmail* references as applied to claim 63 and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,745, 230 to Cao et al. (hereinafter the *Cao* reference); and (iii) claim 92 over the *AirMobile*, *Beyda*, *WyndMail* and *Sendmail* references as

-19-

applied to claim 63 and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,076,241 to Zondervan (hereinafter the *Zondervan* reference).

Again, without acquiescing in the characterization provided in the pending Office Action with respect to the applied references, pending claims, or both, Applicant respectfully submits that the above §103(a) rejections have been overcome or otherwise rendered moot by way of the present response. To the extent the *AirMobile*, *Beyda, WyndMail* and *Sendmail* references fail to teach all the limitations of the pending base claims as currently constituted, reliance on any of the secondary references, e.g., *Moon, Cao,* and *Zondervan* references, is of no avail for purposes of 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Accordingly, the remaining pending dependent claims of the present patent application are believed to be allowable over the entire art of record.

Reservation of Rights

Notwithstanding the foregoing, Applicant reserves all rights not exercised in connection with this response, such as, e.g., the right to challenge or rebut any tacit or explicit characterization of any reference, Applicant's prior responses or of the present claims, the right to challenge any Official Notice(s) taken, the right to challenge or rebut any asserted factual or legal basis of any of the rejections of the present Office Action, or the right to swear behind any cited reference such as provided under 37 C.F.R. §1.131 or otherwise.

Fee Statement

Compared to the highest number previously paid for, the total number of claims and the number of independent claims have not increased. Applicant is filing herewith a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) of the instant patent application and a Petition for a One-Month Extension of Time. Accordingly, applicable fees are being paid via electronic filing. If any additional fees are due or any overpayments have been made, however, please charge or credit our deposit account (Deposit Account No. 03-1130).

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

In view of the fact that none of the art of the record, whether considered alone or in combination discloses, anticipates or suggests the pending claims, and in further view of the above amendments and/or remarks, reconsideration of the Action and allowance of the present patent application are respectfully requested and are believed to be appropriate.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: February 17, 2009

/Shreen K. Danamraj/
Shreen K. Danamraj
Registration No. 41,696

THE DANAMRAJ LAW GROUP, P.C.
Premier Place, Suite 1450
5910 North Central Expressway
Dallas, Texas 75206
Tel (214) 750-5666
Fax (214) 363-8177